

**Amendments to the Figures**

Please replace current drawing sheet 7 of 8 (containing FIG. 7) with the enclosed replacement drawing sheet 7 of 8 (containing amended FIG. 7). FIG. 7 has been amended in two instances (the upper and lower screen shots) to recite “mail.Award.com” in the “Send mail (SMTP) (U):” field. Support for this amendment is found, for example, *inter alia*, at page 7, lines 9-11 of the specification as filed.

## REMARKS

Claims 5-7 are currently pending in the present application. By the present Amendment, claims 5 and 6 have been amended. Claim 5 is the sole independent claim. Applicant requests reconsideration and allowance of this application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

### **Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112**

Claim 6 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Specifically, the Office Action indicated that the claim phrase “sending mail server settings within said terminal device are rewritten as the mail server of said server device” is incomprehensible. Claim 6 has been amended to replace this claim language with “the user is prompted to change outgoing mail server settings of the user’s e-mail client program to a server device address.” Therefore, the applicant submits that amended claim 6 fully complies with 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, and respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

### **Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103**

Claims 5 and 7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Japanese Patent No. JP 11-242714 to Sugimoto Hideo et al. (hereinafter “Hideo”). Claim 6 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hideo in view of Official Notice. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Hideo fails to teach claim 5, as amended, for at least three reasons. First, independent claim 5 has been amended to recite “[a] homepage access system for a chain mailing case where a mail is sent from a first person to a second person, and from the second person to a third person, and so on . . . .” Support for this amendment is found, for example, *inter alia*, at page 8, lines 4-12 of the specification as filed, and also at Figure 4. In contrast to the claimed invention, where a mail is sent from a first person to a second person, and from the second person to a third person, and so on, the system of Hideo discloses a system wherein a *single* sender can send an electronic greeting card to one or more recipients. (See translation of Hideo at page 10, lines 31-33 (emphasis added).) Thus, the Applicant submits that the claimed invention is fundamentally different than the system disclosed in Hideo.

Second, claim 5 has also been amended to recite that the “means for determining the suitability of the e-mail upon completion of creating the e-mail” comprises “a check to determine whether the recipient is on a mailing list.” Support for this amendment is found, for example, *inter alia*, at page 5, lines 10-14 of the specification as filed. The system disclosed in Hideo does not “check to determine whether the recipient is on a mailing list,” as claimed.

Third, claim 5 recites “means for writing at the end of the e-mail a lottery number and an address of said homepage, and . . . sending the e-mail to an e-mail address of an e-mail recipient.” Thus, the claimed invention sends the verified e-mail directly to the recipient with a lottery number attached thereto. This is in contrast to the system of Hideo, which only sends a notice to the recipient that a greeting card is being kept for them.

For the above reasons, the Applicant submits that independent claim 5 is patentable over Hideo. Claims 6 and 7 both depend from claim 5, and are patentable for the same reasons, as well as for reciting additional features. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections of claims 5-7.

### **Conclusion**

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicant believes that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is hereby invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment is respectfully requested.

Date: June 22, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By Steven Schwarz  
Michael A. Sartori, Ph.D.

Registration No.: 41,289

Steven J. Schwarz

Registration No.: 47,070

VENABLE LLP

P.O. Box 34385

Washington, DC 20043-9998

Attorney/Agent for Applicant